

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3-15 are pending. Reconsideration and allowance based on the following comments are respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 9 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson (US 6,148,198) in view of Hunzinger, et al. (US 6,748,217) and Mansfield (US 6,556,825); claims 7 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson, Hunzinger, Mansfield, and Molne (US 5,999,811); claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson, Hunzinger, Mansfield and Halminen (US 6,477,378); and claims 3-6 and 12-15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson, Hunzinger and Coursey (US 5,950,130). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Anderson teaches a mobile station that searches within a roaming area for the best available service. The mobile terminal includes identifier codes corresponding to various service providers stored in a memory. Base stations transmit system identifications which when received by the mobile terminal are compared with the stored codes. From this information, a determination is made based on the comparison of the received signals and codes from various service providers in the area to what service provider to use. See column 3, lines 39-65 and column 4, lines 33 through column 5, line 7. In Anderson, the mobile terminal receives the local service provider information and compares this information with the stored classification data to obtain a preferred provider. The service providers for that particular location are not stored in the mobile terminal nor is domain information regarding a particular country stored.

Hunzinger teaches a mobile terminal in which a current position of the mobile terminal is obtained. This position data is obtained from a system solution database which provides a list of all user zones to which the mobile terminal is subscribed and includes information about the user zones and position information specific to each zone. The position data is used to compare against stored subscriber zones to classify various systems with a priority level. The mobile terminal will then attempt to contact a first system on the priority list. See column 5, lines 10-51. In Hunzinger, a priority list is obtained using data regarding subscriber systems including

position data. The position data helps to prioritize a subscribers system. However, the selection of system is not based on the current position, it is determined on availability of the system as it relates to a prioritized list.

The Office Action recognizes that Anderson and Hunzinger at least fail to teach “a memory having previously stored therein information regarding a plurality of wireless communication systems, each corresponding to a particular communication area within a particular country,” as claimed by applicant. See page 5 of the Office Action. The Office Action alleges that Mansfield provides this teaching. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Mansfield teaches a system in which a cellular module receives a country code of a cell site. The country code of the cell site is stored in the memory of the cellular module. If a country code is received that differs from the stored country code, the new country code is stored in memory and replaces the old country code. This is necessarily performed in order to compare the recent country code against the current received country code. See column 4, line 6 through column 5, line 12.

Applicants claims recite comparing against a plurality of domains or wireless communication systems. Mansfield teaches comparing a country code of a cell site with a recently received country code which may be from a different cell site. A comparison from a plurality of domains or wireless communications is not made. In Mansfield, a single comparison is made to a single country code of a cell site.

Further, applicants claims recite comparing a plurality of domains of wireless communication systems corresponding to a position of radio communication device. In Mansfield, the country code corresponds to the position of the cell site not to the cellular module. Further, Mansfield does not relate its comparison of the country code to the actual position of the cellular module. In Mansfield, the cellular module position is not relevant as its operation is dependant upon where the cell site is located and not the actual position of the cellular module.

Thus, Mansfield fails to remedy the deficiencies of Anderson and Hunzinger. Therefore, the combination of Anderson, Hunzinger and Mansfield fails to teach or suggest, *inter alia*, a memory having previously stored therein information of a plurality of domains and radio communication systems information corresponding to said plurality of domains; a selection unit for selecting the radio communication system corresponding to a domain from the plurality of domains, to which the current position belongs, on the basis of the current position detected by the position detector...wherein said domain information or country domain information are administration information or administrative division domain information in individual countries, as recited in claim 1.

Anderson, Huntzinger and Mansfield also fail to teach or suggest, *inter alia*, a detector to detect a current position of the wireless terminal; a memory having previously stored therein information regarding the plurality of wireless communication systems, each corresponding to a particular communication area within a particular country and a selection unit to select a first wireless communication system from the memory corresponding to the communication area associated with the current position of the wireless terminal, as recited in claim 11.

Regarding claim 15, the Office Action rejects claim 15 in view of Anderson, Hunzinger and Coursey. On page 5 of the Office Action, the Office Action admits that Anderson and Hunzinger fail to teach storing in a memory, information regarding a plurality of wireless communication systems, each corresponding to a particular communication area within a particular country where a plurality of different communication areas are stored in the memory, as recited in claim 15. Applicants respectfully submit that Coursey fails to remedy this deficiency.

Coursey has been provided to teach the display of information to a user regarding the change in the first wireless communication to an alternative wireless communication system. Coursey's system provides a method that includes a mobile station that has a display for providing information to a user. In Coursey's system, the mobile station scans a home band and a secondary band if a control channel is not found on the home band. If the mobile station determines that it is located in the home system, it remains in the home band and obtains service

from the home system. If the mobile station is not located within its home system, a system access list is searched to determine if there is a preferred system in the same area as the current system. If not, the mobile station obtains service on the current system. Coursey's system does not detect a current position of the wireless terminal and does not have a memory in which a plurality of wireless communication systems are stored therein each corresponding to a particular communication area within a particular country.

Therefore, the combination of Anderson, Hunzinger and Coursey fail to teach and every feature of independent claim 15 as required.

In view of the above, applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 11 and 15 are distinguished from the cited references. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1 and 3-15 are distinguishable over the cited art. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Chad J. Billings (Reg. No. 48,917) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: August 7, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By *DRB* #48917
for D. Richard Anderson
Registration No.: 40,439
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant